



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

expense of manufacture and material is much less, it would seem as though it should be adopted, and attention turned to the weight, friction, shape of surface, etc.

Complaint is made of short, light vanes, that they often make a complete revolution in high winds. This could be obviated by increasing the weight, but this would not be as satisfactory as increasing the length. It is very evident that the same vane will not answer for both light and heavy winds. It would seem as though a long flat vane would do for the higher winds; and the lighter winds may be determined by the motion of smoke or a light banner, always being careful to keep the line of sight at right angles to the wind. This question is an eminently practical one. Experiments are much needed to determine the most satisfactory size of surface, length and weight of vane, for winds of different velocities, to satisfy the conditions first laid down.

Since writing the above, it has been suggested to me that the double vane can be so readily braced, it can be made out of very light material, and hence may be much lighter than the flat vane. The fallacy here consists in the implication that a single vane needs any bracing at all. Since there is no strain upon a flat vane, as it always turns immediately into the air-current, it need not be very stiff; but it is far otherwise with the double vane. Here the spreading of the tails at once brings a tendency to collapse, to each tail, which increases with the wind-velocity, and is never absent, being greatest when the vane is in the air-current. Each tail, then, must be far stiffer than the single tail, which has no strain at any time. But this is not all: the material used in the bracing will add much to the weight, especially with the greater angles of the tails. For example: take the most sensitive vane, where $2i = 90^\circ$ and $e = 45^\circ$. If the tails are 4 feet long, the spread at the tips will be 5.6 feet. A width of half a foot would give a strain of 30 pounds, with a wind-velocity of 40 miles per hour, and the tails must be very stiff. In addition, if the web bracing is as stiff as the tails, the total weight would be more than four times that of a single vane with double the surface and better fitted for service.

H. ALLEN.

Philadelphia, March 15.

On certain electrical phenomena.

There are a few mystics in science (I am not one of them), but I fail, even upon a second reading, to discover that shroud of mystery enveloping my letter 'On certain electrical phenomena' (*Science*, No. 211), which seems to have impressed my critic, 'T. C. M.', in a subsequent issue (No. 213).

My letter was copied into a number of the daily papers in the eastern and western cities, and I have letters from people who are strangers to me, in regard to it; but thus far, excepting 'T. C. M.', no one seems to think it 'mysterious.' I am sure I did not when I wrote the account.

Your correspondent further advises me that I should 'possibly eliminate a few of the facts' in making such investigations, to which I can only reply that I am not in the habit of eliminating any of the facts in the premises of any scientific investigation I may be engaged in, whatsoever may be its character. Usually I gather and use all such facts as I can lay my hands on.

As the point is an important one, I would also like

to say to Professor Mendenhall that he evidently misquotes me in the next paragraph of his letter, wherein he says that "Dr. Shufeldt states that he had never observed such exhibitions in Washington." I made no such statement, but did remark that "I had never observed (there) such exhibitions so far as my own person was concerned, and they only gradually developed at this place" (Fort Wingate, N. Mex.). The cases cited for that city by him are very interesting.

I repeat, that in my case the "electrical discharge was considerably greater from the tip of the index-finger than from any of the others of the hand, and gradually diminished in regular order as we proceeded to the little finger;" and this after careful experimentation. I nowhere even imply that this will be found to be universally the case.

Further, your correspondent seems to hold the opinion that every one exhibits such electrical phenomena in the same degree, when submitted to similar conditions to excite it. In this I thoroughly disagree with him; for further experimentation here, goes to show that phenomena similar to those I described in my letter to *Science* are exhibited in varying degree by my three children, whereas on the other hand, in the case of the mulatto child I referred to, it has thus far, after numerous trials, been impossible to excite them in her.

And I must believe, that, when Professor Mendenhall comes to make more extended inquiry among a greater number of people, he will discover that there are many of them who have absolutely never heard of such things, to say nothing of having observed them in the case of their own persons. Common it is, no doubt; and, ah, me! how wise we would all be if we were but only thoroughly informed upon all common phenomena!

R. W. SHUFELDT.
Fort Wingate, N. Mex., March 10.

Comparative taxation.

It is true, as Mr. Atkinson says, that it is easier to criticise than to construct, and Mr. Atkinson deserves credit for his undertaking. Yet criticism of what has already been done may be of value in clearing the way for more perfect work in the future, and I therefore venture to offer a further criticism of some of the views expressed in Mr. Atkinson's letter of March 4.

Mr. Atkinson gives, as a reason for considering national taxation separately, the fact that in Europe so large a portion of the national revenue is expended for 'destructive purposes,' by which I suppose is meant war purposes. The difference between Europe and this country is not so great as most people probably believe. If we consider the army and navy and pensions, which are a war expenditure, we find that in 1885-86 the German empire expended for the above purposes \$110,500,784, and the United States \$111,636,903. A comparison of the relation of these expenditures to total expenditures in the two countries is rendered difficult by the different character of the governments; but considering only the ordinary governmental expenditures, that is, omitting the consideration of railways, mines, etc., we find that in the United States war expenditures amount to 39 per cent of the whole; in the German empire, exclusive of the individual states, to 77 per cent; and in Prussia and the empire taken together, to 28 per cent.